

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 2 and 7-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are amended herein to correct minor grammatical errors and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject which Applicants regard as their invention. No new matter is added by the present amendment.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,480) in view of Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0179719)

Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Higgins et al. and Kobayashi et al. for at least the following reasons.

Applicants first note that independent claims 1, 8 and 11 define:

“Method for isochronous file transfer in a network for transmission of audio/video data, comprising the steps, at the level of a client application, of:

- causing a client device to request the opening of an isochronous connection between the client device and a source device;
- causing the client device to specify a file to be transferred from the source device to the client device in an isochronous manner over the connection;
- **causing the client device to specify a starting point, within said file, from which the transfer is to be carried out,** and
- causing the client device to request initiation of the file transfer from the starting point.” (emphasis added; see claim 1),

“Device for connection to a network for transmission of A/V data, comprising:

- a recording medium for storing isochronous files; and
- a functional component module providing an application programmable interface for access to said recording medium by a client device wherein the application programmable interface comprises a method for transferring an isochronous file over an isochronous connection to the client device **starting from a starting point in the file, specified by the client device.**” (emphasis added; see claim 8), and

“Method for isochronous file transfer in a network for transmission of audio/video data, at the level of a source device comprising a recording medium for storing isochronous files, comprising the steps of:

- **receiving from a client device** a method call including **a request** to transmit an isochronous file over an isochronous connection with the client device, **from a starting point specified in the request**, and

- initiating the file transfer from the starting point.” (emphasis added; see claim 11).

As indicated above, independent claim 1 defines a method for isochronous file transfer in a network for transmission of audio/video data at the level of a client application. The method of claim 1 includes a step of causing a client device to specify a starting point within a file from which the transfer is to be carried out. Independent claim 8 defines a device for connection to a network for transmission of A/V data. The device of claim 8 includes a functional component module providing an application programmable interface for access to a recording medium by a client device wherein the application programmable interface comprises a method for transferring an isochronous file over an isochronous connection to the client device starting from a starting point in the file specified by the client device. Independent claim 11 defines a method for isochronous file transfer in a network for transmission of audio/video data at the level of a source device. The method of claim 11 includes a step of receiving from a client device a method call including a request to transmit an isochronous file over an isochronous connection with the client device from a starting point specified in the request. In other words, independent claims 1, 8 and 11 each define that a client device specifies a starting point within a file from which a file transfer from a source device to the client device is to be carried out.

Neither Higgins et al. nor Kobayashi et al., whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the aforementioned element of independent claims 1, 8 and 11. In formulating the instant rejection, the Examiner admits that Higgins et al. “didn’t disclose: specifying a starting point, within said file, and [sic] from which the transfer is to be carried out” (see page 3 of Office Action

dated June 5, 2006), and relies on Kobayashi et al. for allegedly disclosing this element. Specifically, the Examiner alleges: “[o]n the other hand, Kobayashi discloses: specifying a starting point, within said file, and [sic] from which the transfer is to be carried out (col. Paragraph 0087-0090)” (again see page 3 of Office Action dated June 5, 2006). However, Kobayashi et al. provides no such disclosure. In particular, Applicants note that none of the cited portions of Kobayashi et al., namely paragraphs 0087-0090 (nor any other portion thereof), teaches or suggests, *inter alia*, a method for providing isochronous file transfer from a source device to a client device in which the client device specifies a starting point within a file from which the transfer is to be carried out, as claimed.

Rather, paragraphs 0087-0090 of Kobayashi et al. disclose a technique for transmitting data packets in which, at the start of each communication cycle, a communication packet referred to as a cycle start packet 201 is transmitted for purposes of adjusting the cycle time measured by each node. Kobayashi et al. provides absolutely no teaching or suggestion that the cycle start packet 201 specifies a starting point within a file from which a file transfer is to be carried out, as claimed.

However, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the cycle start packet 201 of Kobayashi et al could be interpreted to specify a starting point within a file from which a file transfer is to be carried out (although Kobayashi fails to provide any support for such an assumption), Applicants note that the cycle start packet 201 is provided (i.e., transmitted) from a source device to a client device (see paragraphs 0087-0090 and FIGS. 1 and 2), not from a client device to a source device, as claimed. Accordingly, neither Higgins et al. nor Kobayashi et al., whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest a method for providing isochronous file transfer from a source device to a client device in which the client device specifies a starting point within a file from which the transfer is to be carried out, as claimed. In view of this clarification, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of claims 10, 12 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,480) in view of Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0179719) and further in view of Katz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,971)

Applicants submit that claims 10, 12 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Higgins et al., Kobayashi et al. and Katz et al. for at least the following reasons.

Katz et al. is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Higgins et al. and Kobayashi et al. pointed out above in conjunction with claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11 and 14. In particular, Katz et al. discloses a computer system that allows the content of a user's collection of fixed and removable media to be managed without regard to a specific type of media (see, for example, Abstract and column 2, lines 48-51). The Examiner relies on Katz et al. for allegedly disclosing an application programmable interface comprising methods for acting upon directories of both asynchronous and isochronous files (see page 6 of Office Action dated June 5, 2006). However, Katz et al. nowhere teach or suggest that a client device specifies a starting point within a file from which a file transfer from a source device to the client device is to be carried out, as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 11. Accordingly, Katz et al. is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Higgins et al. and Kobayashi et al. pointed out above in conjunction with claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11 and 14, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
GAEL MACE, et al.



By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677


THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: August 17, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 on:

August 17, 2006
Date

Karen Schlauch 
Administrator Name